

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

In the Matter of MAURICE GRANT and  
KAMARI GRANT, Minors.

---

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES, f/k/a  
FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

MAURICE ANTHONY GRANT,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

CRYSTAL DEVON BARNETT,

Respondent.

---

In the Matter of MAURICE GRANT and KAMARI  
GRANT, Minors.

---

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES f/k/a  
FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

CRYSTAL BARNETT,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

MAURICE ANTHONY GRANT,

---

UNPUBLISHED  
October 27, 2005

No. 261923  
Wayne Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 04-432447-NA

No. 261924  
Wayne Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 04-432447-NA

Respondent.

---

Before: Gage, P.J., and Hoekstra and Murray, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondents appeal as of right from the trial court order terminating their parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(b)(i) and (j). We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

When respondents finally took eleven-month-old Kamari to the hospital upon the direction of a Protective Services worker, he was diagnosed with nonorganic failure to thrive after any physical illness or disease had been ruled out. Respondents reported that they had been feeding the child as much as he received while in the hospital. However, the doctor assigned to Kamari's case testified that Kamari's grossly emaciated appearance and low weight did not correlate with respondents' claims of what they were feeding him. In addition, although both children were extremely developmentally delayed, respondents did not recognize any problems with the children and continued to assert that there was nothing wrong with the children while they were in respondents' care. Maurice was also exhibiting sexual and violent behavior.

Based on the facts as found by the trial court, the trial court did not clearly err in concluding that a preponderance of evidence established that the children came within the statutory requirements of MCL 712A.2(b)(1) and (2). *In re Brock*, 442 Mich 101, 108-109; 499 NW2d 752 (1993); *In re Ramsey*, 229 Mich App 310, 314-315; 581 NW2d 291 (1998). Nor did the trial court err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Further, the evidence did not show that termination of respondents' parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5).

Affirmed.

/s/ Hilda R. Gage  
/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra  
/s/ Christopher M. Murray